

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTERREMARKS

JUL 18 2006

Claims 1-12, 16-32, 36-52, and 56-58 were pending and stand rejected. Claims 1, 4-5, 8, 10-12, 16, 21, 24-25, 28, 30-32, 36, 41, 44-45, 48, 50-52, and 56 have been amended.

Applicants respectfully note that the Examiner indicated consideration of the Information Disclosure Statement filed on January 31, 2006, but did not indicate consideration of the Information Disclosure Statement filed on October 25, 2005. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner indicate consideration of the documents submitted with this Information Disclosure Statement by initialing the PTO-1449 forms submitted therewith, and attaching same to the next communication to Applicants.

Claims 1-12, 16, 18, 21-32, 36, 38, 41-52, 56, and 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bugnion in view of Schneider. Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Examiner and the undersigned attorney had a first telephonic interview on June 29, 2006, during which they discussed claim 1 as previously pending. No agreement was reached during this interview. The Examiner and the undersigned attorney had a second telephonic interview on July 12, 2006, during which they discussed claim 1 as amended herein. The Examiner agreed that claim 1 as amended was patentable over the cited references. The substance of the second interview is set forth below.

As amended, claim 1 recites:

A computer-implemented method for virtualizing super-user privileges in a computer operating system including multiple virtual private servers, the method comprising:

- associating a user with a first virtual private server, the first virtual private server comprising a first plurality of actual processes executing within the same operating system as a second plurality of actual processes comprising a second virtual private server;
- designating the user as a virtual super-user;

intercepting a call to the operating system for which actual super-user privileges are required, the call made by a process located in the operating system, the process owned by the user; and  
in response to the intercepted call to the operating system pertaining to the first virtual private server:  
granting actual super-user privileges to the user; and  
allowing execution of the call to the operating system.

As amended, claim 1 recites "a first plurality of actual processes executing within the same operating system as a second plurality of actual processes." Bugnion discusses the use of multiple operating systems (one "host operating system" (HOS) and at least one "virtual operating system" (VOS)). However, Bugnion does not disclose, teach, or suggest grouping actual processes executing within the same operating system into a first plurality and a second plurality. Schneider does not remedy this deficiency.

Thus, neither Bugnion nor Schneider, alone or in combination, discloses the claimed element "the first virtual private server comprising a first plurality of actual processes executing within the same operating system as a second plurality of actual processes comprising a second virtual private server." Claim 1 is therefore patentable over Bugnion and Schneider, alone and in combination. Additionally, for the record, Applicants traverse the Examiner's assertions concerning the motivation to combine Bugnion and Schneider.

Independent claims 21 and 41 recite similar language to claim 1 and are also patentable over Bugnion and Schneider, alone and in combination, for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claims 17, 19-20, 37, 39-40, and 57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bugnion and Schneider in view of O'Brien. Applicants respectfully traverse. These claims depend from their respective base claims which were shown above to be patentable over Bugnion in view of Schneider. In addition, these claims recite other features not included in

their respective base claims. Thus, claims 17, 19-20, 37, 39-40, and 57 are patentable over Bugnion and Schneider in view of O'Brien for at least the reasons discussed above.

The claims not specifically mentioned above depend from their respective base claims, which were shown to be patentable over Bugnion and Schneider, alone and in combination. In addition, these claims recite other features not included in their respective base claims. Thus, these claims are patentable over Bugnion and Schneider, alone and in combination, for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as for the elements that they individually recite.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are allowable over the cited art of record and request that the Examiner allow this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in order to advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

XUN WILSON HUANG, et al.

Dated: 7-18-06

By: 

Sabra-Anne R. Truesdale

Reg. No. 55,687

Fenwick & West LLP

Silicon Valley Center

801 California Street

Mountain View, CA 94041

Tel.: (650) 335-7187

Fax.: (650) 938-5200